A GALLERY OF ROMAN SCHOOLMASTERS IN AUSONIUS

The glimpse that we get of Horace's old schoolmaster, Orbilius, is rather sketchy[1]. Suetonius, in his De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus, writes at much greater length about Greek and Roman teachers, but it is not till we come to the fourth century, to Ausonius of Bordeaux, that we find an intimate and detailed presentation of Roman schoolmasters. In his Commemoratio Professorum Burdigalensium[2] Ausonius surveys a group of *professores*, and reveals them, with all their skill in prose and in verse, and with all their acuteness in interpretation, as intensely human creatures. They are willing to help their fellow men in times of stress. Examples are Alcimus Alethius (2) and Attius Tiro Delphidius (5), who practised law. Some, indeed, were frail. Examples are Crispus, the *grammaticus*, who loved too well the glittering goblet[3], and Dynamius (23), who was accused of scandalous conduct. Others sought social distinction, as Alethius Minervius did (6). Others were satisfied with their academic work. All who are mentioned by Ausonius stand out as in some way typical of the feverish intellectual activity of fourth-century Gaul. Some, as Ausonius admits, had but slight claims to admission to the roll, since they were merely ineffectively industrious[4], as Marcellus was (18), while others were *praetenuis meriti* (18.14). Some men are included through the accident of being contemporaneous (8.7–8): quia nostro docuere in aevo, commemorandi <sunt>[5]. Ausonius says[6], 'I shall commemorate the men who are linked to me by love of literature, and by zeal in teaching. Someone may some day do likewise for me'.

The twenty-four versified portraits deal with Greeks and with native Burdigalenses. There is one *orator* among them, Tiberius Victor Minervius, who has the introductory place of honor (1: a piece of forty-two verses). The others are either *rhetores* or *grammatici*.

One, Nepotianus, is both *grammaticus* and *rhetor* (15). Another, Victorius (22), is a *subdoctor* or *proscholus*, i. e. an assistant instructor. Two final pieces, entitled Coronis and Poeta, are reflective summaries. It should be noted that elsewhere Ausonius has something less favorable to say of the *grammatici*. The *grammaticus*, he insists there[7], is foreordained to calamity. No *grammaticus* is happy. If by some chance there *is* one such, he must have left the ranks of the *grammatici!*

Minervius (1) is a somewhat rare combination, a scholar and a good teacher. In the matter of subtle *controversiae* he wrests the palm from Quintilian (1.15–16). His powerful memory is as reliable as written evidence (1.22–24). He can recall matters faithfully (1.29 *fido...recursu*), even after long intervals. Nor is his a narrow, circumscribed spirit. He is a man without guile or bile (1.31–32). Although he is fond of good cheer (1.33 mensa <eius> nitens <est>), he is no gourmand, but a man of dignity and reputation. Did he not train thousands of youth? Compare 1.9–10 Mille foro dedit hic iuvenes, bis mille senatus adiecit numero purpureisque togis....

Of Alcimus Alethius, the *rhetor*, Ausonius has eulogistic things to say (2), and utters them with the impressiveness of Cicero unrolling in the Brutus the line of Roman orators. Alcimus, for instance, outshines his predecessors, the Greek and the Roman practitioners in the art of rhetoric (2.7–8): palmae forensis et camenarum decus, exemplar unum in litteris <es....>. He has handed down to his sons his fine character and the glory of his eloquence (2.25–26). Is the portrait too flattering? 'Are you shocked?', Ausonius asks. 'Excuse the fawning flattery of my pen. Impute it all to my love for you, Alcimus'. Amoris hoc crimen tui est, he cries (2.28). 'Rest content', prays Ausonius, 'and balance the loss of your enfeebled body by your glory' (2.31–32): Quiesce placidus et caduci corporis damnum repende gloria.

In Luciolus the *rhetor* (3), distinguished in prose and in verse, but marked by Lachesis for an early death, Ausonius emphasizes the human qualities. The academic standing of Luciolus is sufficiently indicated by the epithets *facundus* and *doctus* (3.3). Of him, as of a number of others, Ausonius says that he was kindly and soft-spoken. There appears in some of the verses devoted to him an echo of sepulchral phraseology (3.9–12):

Mitis amice, bonus frater, fidissime coniunx,
    nate pius, genitor, paenitet, ut fueris.
Comis convivis, numquam inclamare clientes,
    ad famulos numquam tristia verba loqui.

[1] See Horace, Epistulae 2.1.70–71.
[2] This is to be found in Ausonii Opuscula, Edited by Rudolph Peiper, pages 48–71 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1886).
<The Commemoratio consists of twenty-seven pieces: Praefatio (of six verses); 1–24, sketches, varying in length, all in verse, of *professores;* two afterpieces, 25 and 26 (of ten verses and fourteen verses respectively), entitled Coronis and Poeta.
The Commemoratio may be found also in the version of Ausonius by Hugh G. Evelyn White, in two volumes, made for The Loeb Classical Library (London, Heinemann, New York, Putnam's, 1919, 1921). See 1.96–139.
In citations from the Commemoratio or in references to it, the pieces will be named by number, thus (2). References like (21.7) are to piece and verse. C. K.>.
[3] 21.7–9...creditus olim fervere mero ut Vergilii Flaccique locis <'passages'> aemula <loca> ferres. <Mr. White (see note 2, above) translates this by "at times it was thought that you used to prime yourself with wine in order to produce verse rivalling passages of Vergil and of Flaccus". C. K.>. I give above *locis*, the reading of Codex V, a good codex. Peiper (page 67) prints *iocis*, a conjecture of Heinsius!
[4] 8.5–6 sedulum cunctis <fuit> studium docendi, fructus exilis tenuisque sermo....
[5] In one case Ausonius did not know the man (Thalassus) at all. When Ausonius was a boy, he had heard of Thalassus: hence he included him in his list (12).
[6] Praefatio 4–6.
[7] See an epigram, numbered XV, found in Peiper (see note 2, above), page 426. Compare like hits in Ausonius's Epigrammata: the hit at the *inscite magister* (6: Peiper, page 313); the hit, in 7, on Philomusus, *grammaticus* (Peiper, 313), who thought that the mere purchase of a library brought culture; and like matters in 9–12 (Peiper, 313–314).

In many cases there are extraneous reasons for mention of a teacher. The learned Staphylius, a *rhetor*, had a placid private life (20). Crispus and Urbicus, *liberti*, deserved to have been freeborn (21.27-28). Acilius Glabrio the Younger, a man of kindly nature, was a pupil of Ausonius (24). Victorius, the *subdoctor* (22), was steeped in the lore of antiquity and mythology. He knew the pedigree of the priests of Ceres, or the laws of Draco and of Solon better than he knew Cicero or Vergil (22.5-14). Citarius, the Greek from Sicily, is a second Aristarchus (13). The list becomes crowded with mere names, with men mentioned on account of kinship with Ausonius. An example is Aemilius Magnus Arborius, Ausonius's *avunculus*, whose *stemma* receives more prominence than his oratorical gifts receive (16). Herculanus (11), son of Ausonius's sister, would have reached great heights (he gave promise of ability), but he died young. Attius Patera, of Druid origin, the *rhetor emeritus* (4.1 aetate quamquam viceris dictos prius....), had brilliant rhetorical gifts, and, in addition, was abstemious (4.20 vini cibique abstemius....). If we remember Crispus (21.7), we may infer that this is a reflection on prevailing conditions. On Delphidius (5), on Alethius Minervius (6.6-7 tu primaevis doctor in annis....), on Leontius, nicknamed Lascivus (7.1 Qui colis laetos hilarosque mores....: the name, says Ausonius, 7.5-6, was not deserved), he makes brief comment, of a personal nature. There is a group of Greek *grammatici* whose members make little or no appeal to Ausonius (8). Still, they are of his time, and receive honorable mention on that account (8.19-20 ac meae vocis titulus supremum reddat honorem). There is the instance of literary nepotism, Iucundus (9), who yearned for a literary reputation, a man, indeed, thought by some unworthy of a chair as *grammaticus* (9.1 <te> cathedram temere usurpasse loquuntur), but commendable for his aspirations (9.4-6). Exuperius is a successful *rhetor* (17.10 grandi mercede docendi....), while Sedatus has a reputation equal to his merits (19.6). Dynamius of Bordeaux, an exile (23), had a somewhat romantic history. An unfounded charge drove him to Ilerda in Spain, where he married a wealthy Spanish woman, changed his name, and taught as a *rhetor*. He was recalled to Bordeaux, but returned to Spain, where he spent his last days.

The Coronis is a kind of summary of Numbers 1-24. Ausonius says, in effect, 'The *grammatici* and the *rhetores* whom I have mentioned are countrymen of mine; I mention them because they are dead' (25.41 quos memorasse mihi morte obita satis est). It is, in fact, a human duty, not a literary device, to mention their names (25.8 eloquium ne tu quaere, sed officium....). The Poeta, the final piece, is an *envoi*, a farewell to the shades of the scholars he has listed, a pious hope that their names may live in his verses.

It is not all eulogy, this body of versified sketches. Ausonius touches on the little human foibles, the elements other than acquired skills that make up the human being. He dwells first of all on the oratorical powers of the members of his chosen group, raising them, sometimes, it may be, to more than reasonable

heights. Certain epithets are recurrent: *facundus, doctus, commodus, benignus, frugi, comis, abstemius*. In other cases there is a more general reference, a comparison with other men eminent in the same field; at other times the stress is on the personal side, with emphasis on the pedigree. In these last instances the pedigree seems sometimes the only warrant for inclusion in the roll.

Here, then, we have twenty-four pieces, involving mention of about forty men, all belonging to one generation, more or less prominent in teaching and kindred pursuits, in Bordeaux! That is no mean achievement for Gaul, a district whose cultural development dated back only a few centuries. Particularly striking in this roll of honor is the fact that, though, as was noted above, certain epithets recur, because they are applicable to a number of the teachers mentioned, Ausonius shows facile skill in ringing the changes on the praises of his subjects, by varying a phrase, a term of commendation, a comparison, or by adding specific references, allusions, and personal data, so that he seems to say something specific in each case, and the sketch appears deliberately adapted to its subject. But, after all, many of these pieces would be appropriate for any one of several men. That, however, must be conceded as a privilege of a professor adding immortality to his predecessors and friends[8].

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK HARRY E. WEDECK

REVIEWS

Language and Languages: An Introduction to Linguistics. By Willem L. Graff. New York and London: D. Appleton and Company (1932). Pp. xlvi, 487. $4.00[1].

William Dwight Whitney could write in the Preface of his Life and Growth of Language (1875) that "The science of Language, although of recent growth, is already one of the leading branches of modern inquiry ...." There has been continued research, not unproductive, in this field. The issuing since the close of the World War of an authoritative treatise on the languages of the world[2] by a group of French linguists, the completion a few years ago, by British scholars, of the monumental Oxford Dictionary of the English Language, the publication in this country of an exhaustive

---

[8]The following books have been of service in the preparation of this paper: Sister Marie José Byrne, Prolegomena to an Edition of the Works of Ausonius (Columbia University Press, 1916), and Theodore Haarhoff, Schools of Gaul (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1920). <For a review, by Professor C. C. Mierow, of the latter book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.110-111. C. K.>

<[1]The contents of the book are as follows: Preface (vii-xxi); <List of> Illustrations (xxiii-xxiv); Abbreviations (xxv); Phonetic and Other Symbols (xxvii-xxix); Glossary (xxxi-xlvi); Part I, Constituents and Mechanism (3-212): I, The Phonetic Element in Language (3-70), II, Meaning (71-93), III, Units of Signification (94-160), IV, Accentuation (161-185), V, Categorizing in Language (186-202); Part II, Drift and Diversification (215-436): VI, Phonetic Change (215-257), VII, Causes of Phonetic and Linguistic Change (258-276), VIII, Changes Involving Meaning (277-318), IX, Branches of Language Classification (319-351), X, The Indo-European Family (352-396), XI, The Non-Indo-European Languages (397-436); Bibliography (437-471); Index (473-487). C. K.>

[2]I refer here to the work entitled Les Langues du Monde, Par Groupe de Linguistes suos la Direction de Antoine Meillet and Marcel Cohen (Paris, Champion, 1924).

Bibliography of Writings on the English Language[3], and the appearance in English of works by the Danish philologists Jespersen[4] and Pedersen[5] support the contention that "... There is no good reason for popular ignorance about language, no excuse for failing to embody into our culture the results of linguistic science ...."[6]

The book under review, Language and Languages, comes to hand from the Associate Professor of Germanic Languages at McGill University, Montreal. It suggests at once a comparison with Cannon Farrar's[7] book of the same title, published originally some three score years ago. Much water has passed under the bridge since that era of linguistic scholarship. The controversial part of the older book had to do with the origin of language and a defense of the onomapoetic theory of the origin of language. Professor Graff's volume reflects the more recent emphasis on experimental phonetics, analogy, and phonetic law. We find here stimulating discussions of meaning, accentuation, and the linguistic categories. Scholars will read these with interest, as they will the author's analysis of Units of Signification and the Causes of Phonetic and Linguistic Change. Professor Graff shows that he is thoroughly conversant with the trend of German, French, and Danish scholarship. His work will be valued not only for his own contributions on the several subjects, but for the illuminating discussions of this recent philological literature. For his own approach to certain questions he acknowledges indebtedness to the work of Ogden and Richards[8], and to that of Ferdinand de Saussure[9]. In the narrative and descriptive portions he has drawn upon Meillet[10] and P. W. Schmidt[11]. The work is carefully documented throughout.

The general reader will probably find the first part of the book (Constituents and Mechanism) somewhat forbidding. He may therefore start, as the author suggests in the Preface (viii), with the second, somewhat more concrete, part, Drift and Diversification. Here he will find chapters on the facts and the causes of linguistic change. Proceeding, he will read with interest the chapters on Principles of Language Classification and The Indo-European Family, and with avidity that on The Non-Indo-European languages.

Professor Graff tells us in his Preface (vii) that he has sought to lay emphasis on "...fundamentals and organization rather than on erudition and abundance of facts, while the terminology current among linguists is not sacrificed to the amateur's desire for a more

popular form of presentation...." Herein lie the substantial character of the work and its unique value to the English student of linguistics. Edmonds's Introduction to Comparative Philology[12] and Tucker's Introduction to the Natural History of Language[13] have been out of print for some time. This new Introduction to linguistics will therefore serve a useful purpose. There is at the front of the book (xxxi–xlvi) a glossary of terms; at the back of the book we find a linguistic map of the world. In the excellent Bibliography (437–471)[14] one might expect to find mention of Meaning and Change of Meaning, by Gustaf Stern (Göteborg, 1931)[15].

WASHBURN COLLEGE,
TOPEKA, KANSAS　　　J. E. HOLLINGSWORTH

The Theory of Speech and Language. By Alan H. Gardiner. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch (1932). Pp. x, 332. $3.00.

The book here under review, The Theory of Speech and Language, by Mr. Alan H. Gardiner, is a unique treatise in that it is written not by a psychologist or by a philologist of the usual type (an Indo-European specialist), but by an expert in hieroglyphics and the author of a well-known Egyptian Grammar[1]. Mr. Gardiner is, however, clearly a master in the area of linguistic research within which his book falls[2].

The Foreword (1-14) states the problem Mr. Gardiner had in mind, the method to be employed in its

[3]Arthur A. Kennedy, A Bibliography of Writings on the English Language (Yale University Press, 1927).

[4]Otto Jespersen, Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin (New York, Holt, 1922), and The Philosophy of Grammar (New York, Holt, 1924).

[5]Holger Pedersen, Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century, Methods and Results, Translated from the Danish by John Webster Spargo (Harvard University Press, 1931).

[6]Leonard Bloomfield, Recent Work in General Linguistics, Modern Philology 25 (1927), 211–230.

[7]Frederick W. Farrar, Language and Languages (London and New York, 1899). This work combined two earlier works by Farrar: Chapters on Language (1860), and Families of Speech (1865).

[8]C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, The Meaning of Meaning[2] (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1927).

[9]Ferdinand de Saussure, Cours de Linguistique Générale, second edition, by C. Bally, A. Sechehaye, and A. Reidlinger (Paris, 1922).

[10]See note 2, above.

[11]P. W. Schmidt, Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde (Heidelberg, 1926).

[12]J. M. Edmonds, An Introduction to Comparative Philology for Classical Students (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1906).

[13]T. G. Tucker, Introduction to the Natural History of Language (London, Blackie and Son, 1908).

<[14]Professor Graff's Bibliography, over 34 pages long, must contain 600 to 700 items at least, yet in not a single case does he give the name of the publisher!! It is a pity that a man who took the trouble to put down as much information as Professor Graff put down with respect to books should have failed to take the little additional trouble required for the registration of the name of the publisher. At the very least he should have given such data for all books published in this century. I assume that of course Professor Graff looked at each book to verify his presentation of the name(s) of the author(s), its title, and the place and the date of publication. It would have taken him not more than two or three minutes, in each case, of additional labor to note, copy, and verify the publisher's name(s).

I myself have profited again and again from Bibliographies that did record the name of the publisher. I have been irritated hundreds of times by the failure of authors and reviewers to give such information. C. K.>.

<[15]See below, page 141, note 4. C. K.>.

[1]Mr. Gardiner's book, Egyptian Grammar, was issued at Oxford, in 1927. Prior to that he had written two articles, The Definition of the Word and The Sentence, in the British Journal of Psychology 12 (1922), and Some Thoughts on the Subject of Language, in Man (1919), No. 21, 354–355. <I may refer here to my remarks above, page 139, note 14. In the notes to this review, also, it is impossible to present various important items of information. The books mentioned were, in some cases, not accessible to Professor Hollingsworth. No editor can himself verify every reference or examine every book or article that is mentioned in the periodical which he edits. C. K.>.

[2]Speaking (2) of the controversy between the "exponents of the forward movement...." and the "champions of the conservative party....", Mr. Gardiner maintains that "the practical grammarians should be regarded as protagonists in this controversy rather than the psychologists, logicians, and other philosophically minded adepts of grammar...."

Among the exponents of the "forward movement" in grammar Mr. Gardiner names (2) F. Brunot, author of La Pensée et la Langue (Paris, 1922). Messrs. C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, The Meaning of Meaning[2], 232 (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1927), cite this work as being a "massive onslaught on current grammatical procedure....", and they quote its author as having been convinced long prior to the publication of that book that methods of language-study must no longer be drawn up on the basis of signs, but on the basis of ideas. These authors credit (233) M. Brunot with being "...fully aware that a purely psychological analysis of the speech situation lies behind this functional approach to language...." Mr. Gardiner in the book under review has powerfully underwritten the functional approach to grammar.

study, and some of the practical results which he anticipates from the establishment of a sound general linguistic theory. The present volume is the first of a series in which he hopes to elaborate his theory of speech and language. Here he considers what speech is and how it works; here he attempts something which no one else has attempted (6), "to analyse a single act of speech with fullness or exactitude". Of the method by which he seeks to make this analysis he writes (6–7):

This, then, is my method: to put back single acts of speech into their original setting of real life, and thence to discover what processes are employed, what factors involved. For controversial reasons it seemed desirable to precede the analysis of a simple act of speech (Ch. II) by some discussion of its essential factors (Ch. I). . . .

Mr. Gardiner intends (8) to express his views "not in philosophical jargon, but in the language, and from the standpoint, of everyday life. . . ." As one works out a sound linguistic theory, the grammatical categories will come under scrutiny. With respect to the results of such a scrutiny Mr. Gardiner writes (8–10):

. . . On the whole, I believe it will be found that most of the traditional terms, though often badly named, correspond to real facts and distinctions in the linguistic material. It may be reasonably doubted whether a serviceable grammar which dispenses entirely with such terms as noun or verb will ever be written. The second benefit which I anticipate is, however, that the current accounts given of such categories will be substantially changed; to my mind it is not so much the traditional terms that are unacceptable as the explanations of them which are usually given. Common sense favours this view. It is *a priori* hardly likely that practical grammarians should have continued, generation after generation, to use terms utterly unsuited to the facts. . . . Nevertheless the commonly accepted definitions do, in very many cases, stand in need of serious revision. Even so great a scholar as Meillet could state, not many years ago, that the noun is a means of indicating things, while the verb is an indicator of processes (*procès*). Though these definitions are clearly approximations to the truth, as they stand they are either ambiguous or else definitely false. The second of them is rendered nugatory by the fact that *assassination, flight, pressure* are undoubtedly names of actions or processes, but nevertheless are nouns, not verbs. And as regards the first, denominative verbs like to *cage*, to *motor*, and to *censure*, at the very least render the formulation inadequate. The linguistic theory set forth in this book will, I think, not only throw some light upon the reasons why these definitions are open to objection, but will also show how they may be ameliorated. All words whatsoever will be seen to be names of 'things', that term being understood in the very widest sense as covering material objects, persons, actions, relations, concepts, and figments of the imagination. The so-called parts of speech are distinctions among words based not upon the nature of the objects to which they refer, but upon the mode of their presentation. Thus the name of anything presented *as* a thing is a 'noun', and the name of anything presented *as* an action, or, if Meillet's expression be preferred, *as* a process, is a 'verb'. In the verb to *cage*, reference is made to the thing called a *cage*, but it is not presented as a thing but as an action. In the noun *assassination* reference is made to an action, but it is not presented as an action but as a thing. The details of this topic belong to my second volume; here it need be added only that the terms 'verb' and 'noun' are not really incompatible, but that one and the same thing may be presented simultaneously as an action and as a thing, though possibly never with exactly

equal emphasis. Thus grammar rightly distinguishes between verbal nouns, e. g. (*the*) *murder*, and nominal parts of the verb, e. g. (*the*) *murdering*.

Mr. Gardiner's plan does not call for a discussion of all the phenomena of language. Two common topics—phonetics and the origin of speech—receive only cursory mention.

In Part I of the book (17–177) Mr. Gardiner deals with General Theory. The subdivisions of this Part are I, Speech and the Factors Involved Therein (17–61); II, The Act of Speech, The Sentence and the Word, Speech and Language (62–105); III, The Mutual Relations of Language and Speech (106–177). In Part II, which deals with Theory of the Sentence (181–327), Mr. Gardiner treats IV, The Sentence and Its Form (181–239), and V, The Sentence and its Locutional Content (240–327). In § 77, "Conclusion" (325–327), he gives "a general retrospect" over his book. There is, finally, an Index (329–332). There is no formal bibliography. A conspectus of the main works cited in the notes would have been very useful.

The four factors which with their interrelations constitute for Mr. Gardiner the entire mechanism of speech, and are the substratum of his discussion of General Theory, are (1) speaker, (2) listener, (3) the things referred to, (4) the linguistic material. The first two of these give to speech its cooperative character, and the recognition of their importance (particularly that of the speaker) marks the modern epoch of philological research. With Mr. Gardiner it is not so much the phonetic significance of speaker and listener that counts (although this is fully recognized by him) as the fact that they enter into certain of his fundamental distinctions of general theory as speech and language, "meaning" and "thing-meant". They are also basic to the concepts of "purposiveness" and "situation" (which to Mr. Gardiner play a large part in the theory of the sentence). The importance of the listener has not, perhaps, been duly recognized hitherto by writers on linguistic theory. The third and the fourth factors (as, of course, the first) appear in all discussions of the subject of meaning.

As already intimated, it is characteristic of Mr. Gardiner's method to analyze complete theoretical concepts and to fix attention on the inherent distinctions by stating them in the form of a verbal dichotomy; the elements are then developed into a final definition. Examples are "speech" and "language", "meaning" and "thing-meant", "word" and "sentence", "inner" and "outer" form. Single concepts of prime significance are "predication" (255, 292, 293) and "purposiveness" (96–97, 181, 210, 236, 240, 326). Of paramount importance in Mr. Gardiner's theory, because it is fundamental, is the distinction between speech and language. Speech is (18) "the use, between man and man, of articulate sound-signs for the communication of their wishes and views about things. . . ."[3]

---

[3] Here we have the element of "purposiveness". On page 19 Mr. Gardiner says, ". . . For the development of a language we are bound to assume a purposeful use of articulate utterances in order to influence the conduct of others. . . ." He goes on to say (19) that ". . . Speech of a kind undoubtedly exists among many species of animals. . . .", but that the "purposiveness <of animal cries> is unproved. . . ." C. K.>.

On pages 21–22 Mr. Gardiner writes:

...speech is fundamentally a social activity. Those who have the patience to read my book to the end will have to admit, further, that language is no personal creation, but a codified science built up by a myriad minds with a view to mutual understandings. If language has proved necessary for thought of an abstract kind and for intellectual self-expression, that function is secondary and a by-product, so to speak; surely the primary function of speech was to facilitate co-operation in such matters as could not be indicated by mere pointing or gesticulation. Its vocal character is decisive: Why express oneself aloud, unless it be that inner thoughts are inaccessible to other individuals, while uttered sound-signs are accessible to them? Upon those who refuse to accept this view lies the onus of explaining how, if language arose out of the individual urge to self-expression, it came to be employed later and secondarily for co-operative ends. To cut short this discussion, let it be noted that the expressionistic theory fails to account for either questions or commands. In asking for information the speaker tries to make use of the listener's knowledge, and in giving an order he exerts his authority over the listener to make him perform some action desired by himself. The necessity of the sociological attitude to speech seems herewith to be finally vindicated, and the listener stands forth as an essential factor in its normal occurrence.

To Mr. Gardiner language is "a universally possessed science" (62); speech, "a universally exerted activity....", is the active application of that science (62)[4]. On page 175 he says, "...Language is the mother of all speech, educating it and by past example setting the standard it is expected to follow. But the youngster <speech> is vigorous and experimental, and will often go its own way...." Now the unit of speech is the sentence, while that of language is the word (88)[5]. The second distinction, that between "meaning" and "thing-meant", is one which "runs through speech in all its manifestations...." (30), and applies both to whole sentences and to the separate words composing them. Word-meaning is a conventional thing. It is the main constituent of words, and these are the common possession of both speaker and listener. It is, then, a "purely philological affair...." (30). The "thing-meant", on the contrary, is the speaker's concept (idea), which he wishes to make clear to "the listener's alert and active intelligence...." (50). It is therefore a psychological entity. On page 32 Mr. Gardiner says:

...In plain English, all I am maintaining is that the things we talk about are to be distinguished from the words with which we talk about them. Things must occur to our minds before they can be clothed in words ....[6]

Now words are for the most part "ambiguous in their meaning...." (50). They are merely "clues" (34, 50, 80, et passim), "areas of meaning" (36, 37, 44, 127), and "class names" (38, 43, 74, 256). In general, their function is to help the listener "see what is meant ...." (34), for (34) "...The thing-meant is itself never shown, but has to be identified by the listener on the basis of the word-meanings submitted to him for that purpose...."

Having shown that "...the distinctions which we know by the incorrect name of the 'parts of speech' are really distinctions in the ways in which the things meant by words are presented to the listener...." (39), and that "...the thing meant by any word in any sentence may always be described by a noun or the equivalent of a noun...." (40), Mr. Gardiner maintains that the form in which an idea is presented is always "mentally conditioned...." (143) by the speaker. He then proceeds to state specifically (144) that[6a]

Word-function is the work which a spoken word has to perform in order to present the thing meant by the speaker in the formal character in which he must be supposed to have intended the listener to see it....

He has thus defined the word from the functional point of view[7].

A cardinal feature of Mr. Gardiner's theory of the word and the sentence is 'predication'. Speaking of the correlation of "meaning" and "thing-meant", he writes (33),

...As he <the grammarian> sees it, the meaning of a word or sentence qualifies the thing meant by it in the way that a predicatival adjective qualifies a noun. In the jargon of grammar speech is adjectival, and the universe to which it refers is substantival.

---

[4] To Ferdinand de Saussure (Cours de Linguistique Générale [Paris, 1916]) is given the credit for making clear this distinction between language and speech (107, note 1). It is the theme of the first chapter of Otto Jespersen's book, Mankind, Nation and Individual From the Linguistic Point of View (Harvard University Press, 1925); see especially pages 11–14. Compare Gustaf Stern, Meaning and Change of Meaning with Special Reference to the English Language, 19–20 (Göteborg, 1931?, 1932?: both dates appear on the title page). Mr. Gardiner is the first to base a system upon this distinction: on page 107 he says, "...no small part of my purpose will be served...if the distinction between language and speech is never again suffered to fall into oblivion".

[5] How words (units of language) enter into the sentence (unit of speech) is graphically illustrated by Figure 4 (91). Similarly, Figure 5 (92) shows how syntactic and intonational "forms" enter into the sentence. Words and forms (syntactic and intonational) are a heritage from the past common to both speaker and listener, coming up out of a dim background to function in the present conversation. On pages 90–91 Dr. Gardiner writes: "...Entering into the sentences are the words employed, which have extensive areas of meaning....Far back into the past they go, and only a tiny portion of the areas touches and is concerned with the sentences ...."

[6] From the foregoing account it appears that the "thing-meant" is to be classed as belonging to the third speech-factor ("things referred to"), while "meaning" (i. e. as expressed in word or in sentence) belongs to the fourth factor ("linguistic material"). Compare this statement on page 9: "...All words whatsoever will be seen to be the names of 'things', that term being understood in the very widest sense as covering material objects, persons, actions, relations, concepts, and figments of the imagination...." Messrs. Ogden and Richards (see note 2, above), discussing similar phenomena under the caption Words, Thoughts and Things (see The Meaning of Meaning, 9–11), employ "symbol" (i. e. the word as phonetic symbol), "reference" (thought), and "referent" (thing referred to) to designate the main distinctions; these terms are borrowed by Stern, Meaning...., 31 (see note 4, above), and Willem Graff, Language and Languages, 84–93 (New York, Appleton, 1932). <For a review, by Professor Hollingsworth, of Professor Graff's book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27.138-139. C. K.>
    <[6a]In quotations from Mr. Gardiner's book, his use of italics and of 'black face' type is reproduced. C. K.>.

[7] Professor Edward Sapir, in a book entitled Language (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921), maintains that the word cannot be functionally defined. He remarks (35) that "...the best we can do is to say that the word is one of the smallest, completely satisfying bits of isolated 'meaning' into which the sentence resolves itself...." (compare page 32 of the same work). See also Leonard Bloomfield, Introduction to the Study of Language, 103 (New York, Holt, 1914). <A new edition of this work has appeared, under the title Language (New York, Holt, 1933). A review, by Professor E. H. Sturtevant, of this edition, will be published in the present volume of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. C. K.>. Otto Jespersen (Philosophy of Grammar, 92–93 [New York, Holt, 1924]), observing that neither phonetic nor semantic nor syntactic criteria are adequate for the task, does not proceed to a definition.
    Mr. Gardiner asserts that it is "slightly misleading" (70) to refer to words as semanto-phonetic units, but admits (71) that it cannot be avoided in practice. Thus, on page 70 he writes: "...In reality they <words> are wholly psychical, matters of knowledge and learning, though on one side of their nature they point to a physical occurrence reproducible at will....
    ...It is only the sound-image connected with the words which can be reproduced in a physical copy...."

Again, discussing the fact that predication as a process is involved in all speech, he says (255),

...all formulation in words necessarily constitutes an addition to the thing formulated. I wish to indicate my hat, and in course of doing so linguistically with the words *That is my hat* I am compelled to indicate also the yonderness of my hat (*that*), its 'being' yonder (*is*), and its belonging to me (*my*). The thing-meant, however simply or vaguely conceived of by the speaker before he makes up his mind to speak, becomes much more complicated and distinct as the result of that decision. This thought leads on, by a natural transition, to the topic of **predication.** For predication, in its shortest and pithiest definition, *consists in saying*[8] *something about something*, and this very way of describing the operation implies an act of adding....[8]

In discussing the sentence Mr. Gardiner finds "purposiveness"[8a] to be its characteristic feature; he asserts (184) that "...It is function, not form, which makes a set of words into a sentence...." In that it declares the purpose of the speaker the sentence is thus differentiated from the clause or from any other of its parts. On page 236 he writes:

...A genuine sentence is a unit of actual speech, i. e. language meaningfully applied to some state of things, and purposefully addressed to some listener.

If a set of words passes muster as a sentence, this minimum qualification may be spoken of as "general sentence-quality...." (185), but the concept would be of no particular value. That in the speaker's words (i. e. his sentence) which indicates his precise aim, the particular variety of purpose he had in mind, is "special sentence-quality...." (186) and is of considerable importance. So far as it concerns grammar, it resolves into a discussion of the different kinds of sentence. The four chief factors of speech, in the interplay of which all speech consists, are called into service again at this point as a possible basis for classification of sentences (187). Words ("linguistic material"), being equally important in all kinds of sentence, cannot serve as categories. There is, however, in each type of sentence selected a variation in the prominence of the speaker, the things spoken about, and the listener (187). In his "diagrammatic form" (189) Mr. Gardiner therefore lists four kinds of sentences: (1) Exclamations (under "Speaker"), (2) Statements (under "Things"), (3) Questions, (4) Requests. The two latter, being varieties of demands that call for a response of "information" or "action" respectively, are put by Mr. Gardiner under "Listener". Specific sentence-quality (for this is the general theme under consideration) is thus a kind of "overtone" (194): it "cannot be directly affirmed by the constituent words, but emerges from it as a sort of overtone...." (194). The "essential method of speech", explained in the first two chapters, is now described (195) as corresponding "closely to the

idea suggested by the term **description**, with which my own feeling, at all events, associates notions both of deliberate effort and of gradual approximation...." Mr. Gardiner, however, in fact prefers the term "implication" to the term "description". He writes thus (195-196):

...Words and sentences not only have immediate reference, resulting from intentionally directed meaning, but they also have 'form', a method of conveying knowledge by a sort of overtone, less well characterized by the term 'description' than by the term **implication**. Speech achieves its ends partly by describing, partly by implying.... Apart from these two, so far as I can see, speech employs no other method.

"Sentence-function" is "...*the work which a given sentence does in the capacity indicated by its special sentence-quality....*" (198). The syntactic arrangement of sentences is called "locutional" (201), while the "elocutional" sentence-form depends mainly on intonation (including variations of pitch, rhythm and stress, and all manner of emotional attitudes). The term *nexus*, which Jespersen invented (Philosophy of Grammar, 97 [New York, Holt, 1924]), to designate the subject-predicate relation, is expanded into "predicational nexus" (262). Subject and predicate are "reactions to the same stimulus...." (268); "the predicate embodies the speaker's interest and principal aim, while the subject is vouchsafed merely as a help to the listener ...." (268). This is the definition of subject and predicate (268):

...*Whenever a sentence of other set of words can be divided into two parts of which the one part is felt to convey something as in the course of being said about the thing meant by the other part, the former part is called the predicate, and the latter the subject. . . .*[9]

The much abused copula is defended (222) on the ground that it is indispensable as "a sign that two things of which one, at least, must be explicitly referred to by a word or words, are to be 'linked' together in thought...." "Incongruent function" is exhibited when a noun does service as an adjective, or when a predicational nexus is used in a noun relation (as in indirect statements or questions): see 161-164, 227-233. "...Metaphor and incongruent word-function can be described by a common formula: speech obsessed by language...." (165).

One emerges from the reading of this book with a much clearer idea of what speech is and of the fundamental relations of grammar. The presentation is partly implemented by means of several excellent drawings[10].

[8] In a résumé of the subject (292) one finds "five kinds of predicate" mentioned: "...(1) every word is a predicate in the sense that it declares the nature of the thing to which it refers, the class to which the thing belongs; (2) every sentence as a whole is a predicate or reaction to a state of things which lies outside it; (3) every word as it falls is predicate of a state of things to which the preceding words have provided clues; (4) in all sentences exhibiting the dichotomy of subject and predicate, the grammatical predicate says something about the thing denoted by the grammatical subject; and (5) any given word in a sentence may be used predicatively or in the sense of a logical predicate, i. e. may convey an implicit statement concerning the gist of the sentence as a whole...." <[8a] Compare note 3, above. C. K.>.

[9] Mr. Gardiner submits (98) two definitions of a sentence: "...*A sentence is a word or set of words revealing an intelligible purpose....*", "...*A sentence is a word or set of words followed by a pause and revealing an intelligible purpose*".

[10] A treatise like this should be read from beginning to end and not merely sampled. Otherwise the reader may fail to grasp the full significance of the author's well-considered and carefully formulated statements. In the endeavor to avoid an abstruse scientific terminology Mr. Gardiner had recourse to the alternative of using familiar terms and investing them with an arbitrary or technical meaning. Thus he says (130), "...*word-form is the name of a special kind of meaning which attaches to words over and above their radical meaning....*"; (134), "...*The form of a word, like its meaning, is a fact of language, not of speech....*"; (158), "...Syntax.... may be defined as *the study of the forms both of the sentence itself and of all free word-combinations which enter into it....*"; (232), "... *Grammar is, in the main, concerned with linguistic form in congruent function, and treats of incongruent function only in so far as this is building up new form in which such function will be congruent....*" However, the author is careful to tell us when he is employing a

The forthcoming volumes, in which the author promises to discuss among other things the categories of tense, mood, and gender, will be awaited with interest.

WASHBURN COLLEGE,
TOPEKA, KANSAS　　　　　J. E. HOLLINGSWORTH

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

XI

The Journal of English and Germanic Philology—October, What a Greek Interlinear of the Gothic Bible Text Can Teach Us, Michael Metlen.

The Journal of Higher Education—October, "Without Classical Studies", Milton Haight Turk ["In 1824 Hobart, then Geneva, College took the lead in an educational development of far-reaching significance, though to this day, as an authority remarked recently, 'Nobody knows it!' This undertaking was the establishment of the first college course without Greek or Latin introduced into any college in the English speaking world...."].

The Journal of Philosophy—June 22, Concerning Platonic Esthetics, Gustav Mueller; July 6, Review, very favorable, by Irwin J. Hyman, of Jesse Scott Boughton, The Idea of Progress in Philo Judaeus; October 26, Review, favorable, by D. S. Mackay, of Guido Calogero, Studi sull' Eleatismo; Short review, uncritical, by D. S. Mackay, of A. Ferro, La Filosofia di Platone; Short review, uncritical, by D. S. Mackay, of Ernesto Grassi, Il Problema della Metafisica Platonica; Short review, mildly unfavorable, by D. S. Mackay, of Jean Ithurriagne, La Croyance de Platon à l'Immortalité et à la Survie de l'Âme Humaine.

The Journal of Theological Studies—October, Review, favorable, by A. Nairne, of A. J. Festugière, L'Idéal Religieux des Grecs et l'Evangile; Short review, qualifiedly favorable, by A. Souter, of Pachomiana Latina: Règle et Épitres de S. Pachôme, Épitre de S. Théodore et 'Liber' de S. Orsiesius, Texte Latin de S. Jérôme, Édité par Dom Amand Boon; Appendice: La Règle de S. Pachôme, Fragments Coptes et Excerpta Grecs Édités par L. Th. Lefort.

The Library—June, Review, favorable, by S. G., of Frederic G. Kenyon, Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome; September, Three Little Tudor Books, Eustace F. Bosanquet [the first book discussed in this article is Xenophon's *Treatise of Household*, Translated by G. Hervet in 1532. "Not the least interesting point about this little book is that it is the first direct translation from the Greek into English to which we can give a definite date; all earlier editions of the classics were translations of translations in some other language...."].

word in an unusual sense for the first time. It disarms criticism to read such a statement as this (302-303): "It is difficult and often even misleading to fight against the ambiguity inherent in words, and in the course of this section I have used the term 'statement' freely in no less than three senses.... I make no apology, for in taking this course I have merely employed language as its nature dictates. The reader has cause for complaint only if I have misdirected or mystified him".

The Library Journal—September 1, Old Wine, New Bottles, R. H. Hart [the author explains how the Literature Department of the Enoch Pratt Library created interest in the reading of the Classics in translation].

The Literary Digest—September 30, Treasures From the Wells of Ancient Greeks [with one photographic illustration. This is a short, unsigned article dealing with American excavations in the Agora of Athens]; January 6, A New Version of the Four Gospels, unsigned [with one photographic illustration. This is a discussion of "...the Eastern version of the Four Gospels (A. J. Holman Company, Philadelphia), a translation from the native Galilean Aramaic by George M. Lamsa, a native Assyrian...."]; The Greatest Book Purchase On Record: Acquisition by British Museum of Codex Sinaiticus From Soviet Government for $510,000 Brings to Light Unsuccessful Negotiations by Americans, unsigned [with one photographic illustration. This article gives an account of the discovery of the manuscript by Tischendorf, and narrates events leading to the recent purchase of it by the British Museum].

The London Quarterly and Holbein Review—October, Henry More, Cambridge Platonist, A. W. Harrison ["... He is the most mystical of all the Cambridge Platonists, yet the voice of God to which he listened, was ever the voice of reason too ...."]; Short review, uncritical, by J. T., of Guglielmo Ferrero, The Life of Caesar, Translated by A. E. Zimmern.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT　　　ADOLPH F. PAULI

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

XII

Mercure de France—January 1, Lettres Néo-Grecques, D. Astériotis.

Modern Language Notes—November, Holland's Livy, 1600, and the 1686 Version <of Livy>, M. E. Borish and W. R. Richardson ["In 1686 there was published at London an anonymous translation of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, which Lowndes incorrectly ascribes to Philemon Holland. A comparison of the texts reveals the later publication to be an unquestionably new translation"].

The Modern Language Review—October, Review, qualifiedly favorable, by T. A. Sinclair, of J. H. Baxter, C. Johnson, and J. F. Willard, An Index of British and Irish Latin Writers, A. D. 400-1520.

Nuova Antologia (Rome)—December 16, Roma Antica e l'Adriatico, Pericle Ducati; I Congressi: Il III Congresso Internazionale dei Linguisti in Roma, B. A. Terracini; January 1, Il Cesare della Crocifissione, Giovanni Papini [an *apologia* for Tertullian's favorable opinion of Tiberius]; La Missione dell' Istituto Geografico Militare nella Cirenaica Meridionale, Oreste Marchesi [the article is accompanied by a map]; Filologia Classica, Augusto Rostagni [this contains reviews, favorable, of Hans Lamer,

Wörterbuch der Antike, and Georg Capellanus and Hans Lamer, Sprechen Sie Lateinisch?].

Political Science Quarterly—December, Review, generally favorable, by W. L. Westermann, of A. M. Andréadès, A History of Greek Public Finance, Volume I (translated by Carroll N. Brown).

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America—September, "The Grammarian's Funeral": A Note, J. M. Ariail [a discussion of the significance of the words *calculus* and *tussis* as used in Browning's poem].

Religion in Life—Autumn (1933), Review, favorable, by George M. Dutcher, of William A. Heidel, The Heroic Age of Science, and A Suggestion Concerning Plato's Atlantis.

The Review of English Studies—January, A Note on the 1674 Translation of Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, Guy B. Dolson and W. E. Houghton, Jr.

Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique—October-December, Review, generally favorable, by Albert Pingaud, of B. H. Liddell Hart, Les Guerres Décisives de l'Histoire (translated into French).

Revue de l'Histoire des Religions—May-June, Les Bûchers Sacrés d'Éleusis, Ch. Picard; Review, generally unfavorable, by Ch. Guignebert, of Stephen Lösch, Epistula Claudiana; Review, favorable, by J. C., of Franz Cumont, L'Adoration des Mages et l'Art Triomphal de Rome; Brief review, unfavorable, by Ch. Guignebert, of Max Radin, The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth; July-August, Le Culte de la Grande Déesse, Jean Przyluski; Review, favorable, by Ch. Picard, of G. Méautis, L'Âme Hellenique d'après les Vases Grecs.

Revue des Deux Mondes—January 1, Camille Jullian, by Charles Diehl.

Revue des Questions Historiques—November, La Leçon Éternelle de la Grèce, Maurice Toussaint [an account of the fifth Mediterranean cruise of the Association Guillaume Budé, September, 1933].

Revue Germanique—October-December, Review, qualifiedly favorable, by F. P<iquet>, of Charles B. Lewis, Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance: A Study of the Sources of Chrestien de Troyes' "Yvain" and Other Arthurian Romances.

Revue Historique—May-June, Review, generally favorable, by Ch. Picard, of E. Lasserre, L'Iliade d' Homère: Traduction Nouvelle avec Introduction et Notes; Review, generally favorable, by Aug. Audollent, of Albert Grenier, Manuel d'Archéologie Gallo-Romaine, Première Partie; Review, generally favorable, by Jérôme Carcopino, of Corrado Barbagallo, Storia Universale: Roma Antica, Volume I; July-August, Review, favorable, by A. Merlin, of David M. Robinson (Editor), Excavations at Olynthus, Parts V and VI, and Mabel Gude, A History of Olynthus.

The Romanic Review—October-December, Review, mildly unfavorable, by Arpad Steiner, of Ephraim Cross, Syncope and Kindred Phenomena in Latin Inscriptions from the Parts of the Roman World Where Romance Speech Developed, and, unfavorable, of George L. Trager, The Use of the Latin Demonstratives (Especially "Ille" and "Iste") up to 600 A. D. as the Source of the Romance Article.

School and Society—January 6, Review, generally favorable, by William McAndrew, of Helen M. Eddy, Instruction in Foreign Languages; Brief reviews, uncritical, by William McAndrew, of W. L. Carr and George D. Hadzsits, The Living Language, Mary T. Brennan (and Others), Exploring Latin, Mima Maxey and Marjorie J. Fay, New Latin Primer, Mima Maxey, Cornelia, and Marjorie J. Fay, Carolus et Maria.

Studies in Philology—January, Review, qualifiedly favorable, by R. E. Parker, of Philip S. Allen, Medieval Latin Lyrics.

Wesleyan University,
  Middletown, Connecticut   J. W. Spaeth, Jr.